

College of Education and Affiliated Programs Annual Assessment Report – Fall 2010 For School Psychology Program

Note: this report presents and analyzes data from the 2009-2010 academic year.

Background

1. Describe your program (enrollment, number of faculty, general goals). Have there been any major changes since your last report.

The philosophy of the School Psychology Credential Program is based on an ecological theoretical perspective (Brofenbrenner, 1979). By promoting an ecological model, candidates learn to understand that PreK-12 student achievement and behavioral difficulties result from a discrepancy between the developing capabilities of the student and the multiple demands of his/her environment (Ogbu, 1981; Sroufe, 1979).

The following **goals** of the school psychology program are based on the Philosophy, Values and Beliefs statement presented above, and support the Theme and Mission Statement of the College of Education. The school psychology program goals are to:

- Provide competent instruction in all areas related to the practice of school psychology;
- 2. Advance the knowledge base in school psychology through student research, and the research and writing of faculty;
- 3. Develop in school psychology graduate students a sense of the necessity for life-long independent study as well as an appreciation of the value of collaborative interactions;
- 4. Serve the needs of the community by training school psychology graduate students to provide professional services to students, schools and the community;
- 5. Prepare school psychology graduate students to meet all entry-level and continuing education standards for credentialing and licensure appropriate to their future work settings.

The CSULB School Psychology Credential Program is a 61 semester unit program (plus 9 units of prerequisite courses) housed within the Advanced Studies in Education and Counseling Department (ASEC) within the College of Education (CED). Nine of the 61 units are completed as part of candidates' master's degree program. Two distinct types of candidates complete the program: those who have already completed a master's degree in the behavioral or educational sciences from an accredited university (i.e. "Credential Only"), and those who complete CSULB's Master's Degree in Education, Educational Psychology Option (i.e., "Joint" educational psychology degree and school psychology

credential program). Both types of candidates typically complete the program in three years, though the latter typically take summer school.

The program currently serves 54 full- and part-time candidates with three full-time faculty members devoted to the program. Table 2 below is a summary of candidates admitted to and those who completed the program during the 2009-2010 school year.

Table 2
Program Specific Candidate Information, 2009-2010 (snapshot taken F09)¹

| Category | Transition Point 1 | | | | |
|----------|----------------------|----------|--------------|--|--|
| | Admission to Program | | | | |
| | Applied | Accepted | Matriculated | | |
| | # | # | # | | |
| TOTAL | 127 | 38 | 24 | | |

Table 3
Program Specific Candidate Information, 2009-2010 (snapshot taken F09)

| | Transition Point 2 | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | Advancement to Culminating Experience | | | |
| | # | | | |
| Thesis (698) ² | 5 | | | |
| Comps ³ | 13 | | | |

¹ Represents Educational Psych and School Psych program totals.

² This is data on students who were enrolled in thesis work during Fall 2009 and Spring 2010. This figure may include students who actually "crossed into" this transition point prior to Fall 2009 and were still making progress on their theses at this time.

³ This is data on the number of students who *applied* to take the comprehensive examination in Fall 2009, Spring 2010, or Summer 2010. The data include students who may not have taken or passed the examination(s).

Table 4
Program Specific Candidate Information, 2009-2010 (snapshot taken F09)

| | Transition Point 3 |
|-------------------------|--------------------|
| | Exit |
| | # |
| Degree and Credential | 12 |
| Credential ⁴ | 4 |

Table 5 Faculty Profile 2009-2010⁵

| Faculty Profile 2009-2010 | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--------|--|--|--|--|
| Status | Number | | | | |
| Full-time TT/Lec. | 4 | | | | |
| Part-time | 1 | | | | |
| Lecturer | 1 | | | | |
| Total: | 5 | | | | |

2. How many of the total full- and part-time faculty in the program reviewed and discussed the assessment findings described in this document? Please attach minutes and/or completed worksheets/artifacts to document this meeting.

Five. Please see attached program meeting minutes.

Data

- 3. Question 3 is in 2 main parts focused on *primary* data sources related to: student learning and program effectiveness/student experience:
 - a. <u>Candidate Performance Data</u>: Provide *direct* evidence for the student learning outcomes assessed this year and describe how they were assessed (the tools, assignments, etc. used). Describe the process used for collection and analysis. Present descriptive statistics such as the range, median, mean, percentage passing as appropriate for each outcome.

⁴ Data for Initial and Advanced Credential Programs reflects students who have filed for their credential with the Credential Office. These data generally include students who have completed the program 1 or more years prior to filing their credential request, particularly related to the advanced credential programs. Data are reported for Summer 2009, Fall 2009, and Spring 2010.

⁵ Represents Educational Psychology and School Psychology program totals.

Candidate performance on SLOs 1, 3, 7, 9, and 10 were analyzed. Average student performance on the signature assignment (School-Based Academic Case Study) assessing SLOs 1 and 3 in EDP 527 in Fall 2009 was 88.54%, with a range of 80.77% to 95.41% across criteria. For SLO 7, average student performance on the relevant signature assignment (Counseling Case Study) in EDP 517 was 92.44%, with a range of 85.29% to 97.06%. Candidate performance on the signature assignment (Program Evaluation) measuring SLO 9 in EDP 641B, was 95%, with a range of 75% to 100%. Average student signature assignment (Ethics Case Study) performance measuring SLO 10 in EDP 642A was 79.98%, with a range of 75% to 84.38%.

b. <u>Program Effectiveness Data</u>: What data were collected to determine program effectiveness and how (e.g., post-program surveys, employer feedback, focus groups, retention data)? This may be indirect evidence of student learning, satisfaction data, or other indicators or program effectiveness. Describe the process used for collection and analysis. Present descriptive statistics such as the range, median, mean, or summarized qualitative data, for each outcome.

In December 2009, a web-based alumni survey was disseminated to all graduates for whom we had a current email address. A total of 87 graduates were invited to complete the survey via email, and 61 graduates completed the survey, with the largest percentage of participants from the 2009 graduating year. According to the survey results, 75.8% of respondents indicated that the training they received in data-based decision making at CSULB was "excellent" while 77.4% indicated excellent training in collaborative consultation. Areas of training respondents indicated were "poor" included mental health (6.5%) and ethical and legal practice (6.5%).

4. **OPTIONAL**: You may provide *additional* information (e.g., other data, copies of letters of support from granting agencies or school staff, etc.) about candidate performance, the student experience or program effectiveness used to inform programmatic decision making. This may include quantitative and qualitative data sources.

Analysis and Actions

5. What do the data for each outcome say regarding candidate performance and program effectiveness? Please note particular areas of strength or areas in need of improvement.

Identified areas of strength based on student performance on the aforementioned signature assignments include using data to identifying problems, writing skills, developing rapport with clients, offering practical information to clients, and providing basic program evaluation information. Alumni data indicate training in using data to inform decisions, and collaborative consultation skills are strength of the program.

Identified areas in need of improvement include intervention planning, thoroughness in using and analyzing resources, use of statistics, focusing on a problem or solution in a counseling session, and ending a counseling session with closure. Mental health and ethical and legal practices are areas in need of enhanced training within the program.

6. How do these findings compare to past assessment findings?

Some of these data are consistent with previous findings, such as graduate satisfaction with training in counseling and ethical/legal. Student writing skills are stronger than previous assessment data indicate.

7. What steps, if any, will be taken with regard to curriculum, programs, practices, assessment processes, etc. based on these findings in Questions 5 and 6? Please link proposed changes to data discussed in Q5.

| Priority | Action or Proposed Changes To Be Made | By Whom? | By When? | |
|----------|--|--------------------|----------------|--|
| 1 | Ethics Assignment: instructors to emphasize and model using resources (e.g., legal mandates) when analyzing case studies. | Kristin Brandon | Fall 2011 | |
| 2 | Counseling Case Study: beef-up instruction in evidence-based intervention development, providing clarity at closing, and narrowing problem identification. | Brandon | Fall 2011 | |
| 3 | School-Based Academic Case Study: beef-up instruction in evidence-based intervention development. | Kristi | Fall 2011 | |
| 4 | Program Evaluation: review statistical procedures appropriate for program evaluation purposes. | Kristin | Spring 2011 | |
| 5 | Meet with Don to discuss changing signature assignments to measure one SLO only. | Kristi | June 2011 | |

Table 6 Program Student Learning Outcomes and Relevant Standards

| SLOs | Outcome 1 | Outcome 2 | Outcome 3 | Outcome 4 | Outcome 5 | Outcome 6 | Outcome 7 | Outcome 8 | Outcome 9 | Outcome 10 |
|----------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| SLOs | Outcome 1 Use systematic assessment models to collect data that are useful in identifying strengths and needs, understandin g problems, and measuring progress; assessment results are then translated into empirically- based decisions about service delivery, and used to evaluate the outcomes of | Outcome 2 Demonstrate knowledge of behavioral, mental health, collaborative, and/or other consultation models and their application to particular situations through effective collaboration with others in planning and decisionmaking at the individual, group, and system levels | Outcome 3 In collaboration with others, develop appropriate cognitive and academic goals for students with different abilities, disabilities, strengths, and needs; implement interventions to achieve those goals; and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions | Outcome 4 In collaboration with others, develop appropriate behavioral, affective, adaptive, and social goals for students of varying abilities, disabilities, strengths, and needs; implement interventions to achieve those goals; and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions | Outcome 5 Demonstrate the sensitivity and skills needed to work with individuals of diverse characteristic s and to implement strategies selected and/or adapted based on individual characteristic s, strengths, and needs | Outcome 6 Work with individuals and groups to facilitate policies and practices that create and maintain safe, supportive, and effective learning environments for children and others | Outcome 7 Provide or contribute to prevention and intervention programs that promote the mental health and physical well- being of students | Outcome 8 Work effectively with families, educators, and others in the community to promote and provide comprehensi ve services to children and families | Outcome 9 Evaluate research, translate research into practice, and understand research design and statistics in sufficient depth to plan and conduct investigations and program evaluations for improvement of services | Outcome 10 Practice in ways that are consistent with applicable standards, are involved in their profession, and have the knowledge and skills needed to acquire career-long professional development |
| Signature Assignment(s) | Parent interview, Case study | Class presentation | Case study | Case study | Survey | Class presentation | Case study/ Report | Parent interview | Case study/Report | Report of findings |
| National Standards | Data-Based Decision Making | Collaborative Consultation | Effective Instruction/ Cognitive Development | Socialization/ Development of Life Skills | Student Diversity | School/ Systems Organization | Prevention/ Mental Health | Home/ School/ Community Collaboration | Research | Ethical/Legal Practice and Professional Development |
| State | | | | | | | | | | |
| Standards | | | | | | | | | | |
| Conceptual | Research and | Service and | School | School | Values | Prepares | Prepares | Service and | Research and | Prepares |
| Framework | Evaluation | Collaboration | Improvement | Improvement | Diversity | Leaders | Leaders | Collaboration | Evaluation | Leaders |
| NCATE Elements | Knowledge and skills – other | Knowledge and skills– other | Knowledge and skills- other | Student learning– other | Professional Dispositions | Student learning- other | Knowledge and skills- other | Knowledge and skills- other | Knowledge and skills- other | Professional dispositions |